

### REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-28 were rejected in the last Office Action. The claims, as amended, are listed above. Claims 20 and 25 have been canceled. No claims have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-19, 21-24, and 26-28 are now pending in the present application.

Applicant requests reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

### Claim Objections

Claims 1, 8-11, 19 were rejected due to informalities.

Claim 1 was objected to due to missing acronym identifiers. In response, claim 1 has been amended to include the acronym identifiers.

Claims 8-11 were objected to for unclear claim language corresponding to the file and the server functionality. In response, claim 8 has been amended to clarify that the file identifies support services.

Claim 19 was objected to for erroneously missing the term "of." In response, claim 19 has been amended to include the missing term.

Thus, Applicant requests that the objections be withdrawn.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claim 1-11, 13, 18-21 and 23-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Haddock et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,104,700).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Amended claim 1, in relevant portion, recites a communications device comprising ports receiving bandwidth allocation requests from end units. The communications device also comprises a set of algorithm processors, separate from said server, that are accessed by said server to perform bandwidth allocation calculations, wherein a subset of the algorithm processors are reserved to perform bandwidth allocation for packet voice traffic with packet delay and interpacket jitter requirements. Claim 19 includes similar limitations.

Haddock generally discloses a policy-based mechanism for managing, monitoring and prioritizing traffic within a network (Abstract). Specifically, a quality of service profile of a video traffic group can be defined to have high priority.

However, Haddock fails to disclose the invention as recited in claim 1. First, the video traffic group of Haddock does not disclose voice traffic. The characteristics of voice traffic recited in claim 1 include packet delay and interpacket jitter requirements. In other words, a subset of algorithm processors in claim 1 is optimized for performing calculations for voice traffic characteristics of packet delay and interpacket jitter requirements. By contrast, Haddock merely prioritizes video traffic. The only special characteristic of video traffic disclosed by Haddock is bandwidth. But Haddock is silent regarding specific characteristics of video traffic used in calculations for determining allocation requests, as is recited in claim 1.

Therefore, claim 1, and all related claims are patentable over Haddock for at least these reasons. Furthermore, claim 19, and all related claims, are patentable over Haddock for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 12, 14, 16-17 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haddock in view of Ofek (U.S. Patent No. 6,760,328). Because these claims depend from a patentable base claim, and the Ofek reference fails to cure the deficiencies of the Haddock reference, the dependent claim are patentable for at least the same reasons as the corresponding base claims, as discussed more fully above.

## CONCLUSION

Applicant's attorney believes this application is in condition for allowance.

Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below. Examiner is authorized to apply any deficiency or overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2120.

Respectfully submitted,

November 14, 2008

/Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr./  
Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr.  
Reg. No. 30,801

**Customer Number 29141**

(650) 493-4540

(650) 493-4549